

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification; rejected claims 1-5, 13-15, 20-24, 32-36, 44-46, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; and rejected claims 1-5, 13-15, 20-24, 32-36, 44-46, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over JP 10-65662 to Ishiguro et al. ("*Ishiguro*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,409 to Schneck et al. ("*Schneck*") U.S. Patent No. 6,374,036 to Ryan et al. ("*Ryan*") and "Applied Cryptography" by Schnier ("*Schnier*").

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 20, 22, 32, 34, 44, 46, 51, and 53, cancel claims 2, 14, 21, 33, 45, and 52, and add new claims 63-68. Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 15, 20, 22-24, 32, 34-36, 44, 46, 51, 53-55, and 63-68 are pending and under current examination.

The Examiner objected to the specification as allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis for a "storage means for storing the encrypted identification information and the identification information" (Office Action at p. 4). While Applicants respectfully disagree, the objection is now moot in light of the amendments to the claims presented herein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5, 13-15, 20-24, 32-36, 44-46, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner indicates that the specification does not support a "storage means for storing the encrypted identification information and the identification information" (Office Action at p. 4). While

Applicants respectfully disagree, the rejection is now moot in light of the amendments to the claims presented herein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5, 13-15, 20-24, 32-36, 44-46, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent claim 1, for example, recites an information-signal playback system comprising an information-signal reading apparatus and an information-signal processing apparatus. The information-signal processing apparatus comprises, among other things, a “comparing means for comparing the decrypted media type information with the media type information, to judge if an attempt to alter the media type information has been performed.” The four cited references, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest the claimed comparing means.

The Examiner concedes that *Ishiguro* fails to disclose an output means for supplying both encrypted and unencrypted information on copyright protection (final Office Action at p. 5). *Ishiguro* also fails to disclose judging whether an attempt to alter media type information has been performed. Further, *Ishiguro* fails to disclose comparing decrypted media type information with media type information. Therefore, *Ishiguro* fails to teach or suggest a “comparing means for comparing the decrypted media type information with the media type information, to judge if an attempt to alter the media type information has been performed,” as recited by independent claim 1.

Schneck also fails to disclose the claimed comparing means. *Schneck* discloses distributing packaged data 108 that includes an encrypted version of access rules 116 (*Schneck*, col. 10, lines 47-53, and Fig. 2). Alternately, *Schneck* discloses that access rules 116 can be provided separately from packaged data 108 (*Schneck*, col. 10, line 49). Thus, *Schneck* uses one of two secure methods for ensuring the secrecy of access rules 116, either encrypting them, or providing them separately to a trusted user. However, *Schneck* fails to disclose judging whether an attempt to alter media type information has been performed. Further, *Schneck* fails to disclose comparing decrypted media type information with media type information. *Schneck*, therefore, does not teach or suggest the claimed “comparing means for comparing the decrypted media type information with the media type information, to judge if an attempt to alter the media type information has been performed,” as recited by independent claim 1.

Ryan also fails to disclose the claimed comparing means. *Ryan* discloses, “a watermark . . . is conventionally embedded in a video image. A subset of the watermark bits carries a digital attribute (a number) which is a numeric characteristic of the video signal, for instance an average amplitude of the video signal over one video field or frame” (*Ryan* col. 3, lines 1-6). *Ryan* continues, “[t]he compliant digital video recorder . . . examines the watermark, verifies it, . . . and extracts the associated attribute value from the watermark. The compliant recorder also . . . measures the attribute of that particular field, and compares the measured attribute to the extracted attribute value” (*Ryan* col. 3, lines 26-36). However, the attribute value in *Ryan* is not

“media type information.” Moreover, *Ryan* fails to disclose judging whether an attempt to alter media type information has been performed. Further, *Ryan* fails to disclose comparing decrypted media type information with media type information. Thus, *Ryan* does not teach or suggest the claimed “comparing means for comparing the decrypted media type information with the media type information, to judge if an attempt to alter the media type information has been performed,” as recited by independent claim 1.

Schnier also fails to disclose the claimed comparing means. *Schnier* discloses a “one-way hash function . . . that takes a variable-length input (called a pre-image) and converts it to a fixed-length (generally smaller) output string (called a hash value)” (*Schnier* p. 30). However, *Schnier* fails to disclose judging whether an attempt to alter media type information has been performed. Further, *Schnier* fails to disclose comparing decrypted media type information with media type information. *Schnier* therefore fails to teach or suggest the claimed “comparing means for comparing the decrypted media type information with the media type information, to judge if an attempt to alter the media type information has been performed,” as recited by independent claim 1.

Although of different scope, independent claims 13, 20, 32, 44 and 51 distinguish over the four cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1, claim 15 depends from claim 13, claims 22-24 depend from claim 20, claims 34-36 depend from claim 32, claim 46 depends from claim 44, and claims

53-55 depend from claim 51. As already discussed, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed output means and comparing means.

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claims 1, 3-5, 13, 15, 20, 22-24, 32, 34-36, 44, 46, 51, and 53-55, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established with respect to these claims. Applicants therefore request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2007

By:



Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921